

**Oregon Board of Forestry
Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee Meeting
July 2, 2007**

Oregon Department of Forestry
2600 State Street
Salem, OR 97310

Meeting Summary

Opening Remarks and Reviewing Meeting Agenda

Steve Hobbs, Chair of the Advisory Committee and the Board of Forestry, welcomed the Committee members and others attending the meeting, and reviewed the proposed agenda and meeting objectives which included:

- Agreeing on the process for moving forward
- Agreeing on the most pressing problems for committee consideration
- Developing a meeting plan and identifying potential speakers to address the most pressing problems selected by the committee
- Public comment
- Identifying potential policy recommendations for the natural processes issue

Steve noted that the discussion today would be pivotal; the committee would be coming to closure on the problems/issues, and developing a timeframe for moving forward. He stated that he wanted to narrow the number of issues down for the committee can then tackle in-depth.

Process for Moving the FFAC Forward

Kevin Birch reviewed the revised “Process Moving Forward, dated 6/22/07, Draft Version 4”. Committee discussion included the number of meetings remaining to deal with the issues (eight, following this meeting) and the need for timely action and how best to accomplish the committee’s goals.

Steve Hobbs reviewed a “Concept Discussion Paper – Implementation Subcommittee, Revised June 29, 2007”, he had prepared in response to previous discussions about how best to ensure that the committee recommendations are acted upon. After committee discussion, the subcommittee will include: Chuck, Ralph, Russ (chair), Steve Grasty, Wade, and a Board of Forestry member that Steve Hobbs will recruit.

Most Pressing Problems

Robert Fisher noted the committee needed to determine the problems that the committee would address. Committee members, planning team members, and Cathy MacDonald (attending the meeting from The Nature Conservancy in Russ Hoefeldt’s absence) then each commented on the problems they would like the committee to work on using the Most Pressing Problems document (dated 6/22/07, Draft Version 9).

General Comments

- There is some overlap and potential for consolidation
- Committee needs to look at issues of lack of trust and process, the rural/urban divide
- Two categories of problems -- forest related (Problems #2, #6, #7, #9, and #11) and institutional related (Problems #1, #3, #4, #5, #8, #10); Committee should emphasize the forest problems as institutional problems occur because the forest problems haven't been handled and people learn how to respond (i.e., legal action, etc.)
- Solutions for fixing the overarching problems could help other issues
- Problems #2, #3, #6, #9, and #11 are associated with concerns about the condition of the forests and services provided; they also tie to the vision statement
- Problems #1, #4, #9, #10, and an aspect of #3 are barriers between where we are today and where we want to go
- Most important to look long-term because forest management is a long term issue and what you can do for 10, 20, or 30 years, may not be sustainable for the long term
- Social contract needs to be addressed
- Recognize and quantify the ecological services the forests can provide
- Problems 1, #2, and #3 – probably the most important, and the rest of them follow along, connected in many ways
- Problems #2, #3, #9, and #10 are connected
- Problems #1 and #5 are barriers
- Combining issues makes it difficult to find policy solutions to cover all of the topics
- The link between the issues is creating a healthy forest plan

Problem # 1

- Huge issue, question what the committee can accomplish
- Key problem
- Committee cannot solve it, do not spend a lot of time on it
- Committee may influence

Problem # 2

- Most important
- Mandated cut and working on health issues would help rural communities
- Link with #6, #7, #9 and #11
- This problem is largely because of #1

Problem # 3

- Most important
- Discussion will be educational
- Consolidate #8
- Impacts rural communities socially and economically
- Mandated cut and working on health issues would help rural communities
- Infrastructure and social-economic functions in rural communities are major issues
- Many states have even greater problems than Oregon and have lost all of their infrastructure

Problem # 4

- A component of how issues #1, #2, and #3 are addressed
- Huge issue, question what the committee can accomplish
- Likely to come up in discussion of other issues
- Link with #10, they go hand-in-hand
- If we find common ground, the legal issues may resolve themselves (to some degree)

Problem # 5

- Involves bringing communities, tribes, etc., into the conversation
- Difficult subject
- Can this committee create some type of institution or model that develops a structure to resolve conflicts?
- Lower priority
- Long-term process issue
- There are more cooperative local partnerships and processes exist than people are aware of

Problem # 6

- Very important,
- Combine with #2

Problem # 7

- Consolidate with #2
- Broad issue

Problem # 8

- Second tier, very broad and vague, might fit as part of #3
- Lower priority
- Could be dropped
- Could be an important discussion for the future

Problem # 9

- Important to the conservation community, could be consolidated as part of #2
- Are we doing a good job of protection or do these need some proactive action, or maybe tie in with #2 and policy change?
- Key issue on the ground

Problem # 10

- Second tier and lower priority, likely to come up in discussion of other issues
- Can this committee create some type of institution or model that develops a structure to resolve conflicts?
- Crosses all areas
- Link with #4, they go hand-in-hand

Problem #11

- Very important, make first-tier
- Consolidate with #9, #6, and #1, #2, and #3
- Combine with #2
- Are we doing a good job of protection or do these need some proactive action, or maybe tie in with #2 and policy change?
- Encompasses all species, not just an ESA issue; species have conflicting needs
- Very complex complicated issue

Committee members discussed meeting planning and sequencing and agreed to the following plan for addressing the problems:

- August 2007: Problem #1 - Funding
- September 2007: Problem #2 – Natural Processes (including water and climate change)
- October 2007: Problem #2 – Natural Processes (including water and climate change)
- November 2007: Problem #3 - Timber Harvest/Infrastructure (including global context)
- December 2007: Problem #3 - Timber Harvest/Infrastructure (including global context)
- January 2008: Problem #9 – Older Forests (including wildlife habitat diversity)
- February 2008: Problem #9 – Older Forests (including wildlife habitat diversity)
- March 2008: Problem #5 – Process to coordinate policy decisions

Developing the plan was necessary to structure the committee's work and schedule speakers, and can be revisited by the committee as needed. The committee also will have to spend time looking at integrating the issues and proposed solutions.

Committee members suggested the following possible presenters/speakers for the identified issues:

- Problem #1: Someone from NRDC; Erica Rhodes, ex-House Resources staff person, now a political lobbyist in Washington, D.C.
- Problem #2: Dr. Waring, OSU (regarding insects); Scott Black, Xerxes Society (regarding insects); Tony Svejcar (re juniper and natural processes); Retired judge Dennis Reynolds; Greg Filip, USFS entomologist/pathologist; Darrel Ross (entomologist); David Shaw (forest pathologist)
- Problem #3: Jim Walls, retired federal employee, runs Lake County Resources Initiative; someone from EcoNorthwest; Eric Hovee, economist; Commissioner Doug Roberts, Douglas County and Chair of the Association of O&C Counties
- Problem #4: Jack Ward Thomas, retired USFS Chief
- Problem #5: County Commissioner Ben Boswell (note: also could speak to Problem #3); Mike McArthur, Associated Oregon Counties
- Problem #6: Robert Beschta, OSU; Gordie Reeves, OSU Forest Laboratory in Corvallis; Phil Ward; Gordie Reeves, OSU Forest Laboratory in Corvallis
- Problem #9: Norm Johnson; Jerry Franklin

Committee members also discussed the importance of speakers focusing on solutions and not reiterating the problems. Speakers can briefly describe the problem to set context, with the bulk of their presentations on proposed solutions. The following questions (posed to the presenters who appeared at the May meeting in Bend) will be provided to the speakers:

1. What are the important factors contributing to the problem?
2. What are possible solutions (policy changes) to the problem?

3. What are the consequences of the potential solutions (policy changes)?
4. What are the barriers to implementing your suggested solutions (policy changes)?

August meeting planning

Lisa and Mike offered to put together a short paper on federal agency budget process, mechanics, history of budget amounts, etc. They also noted that they could arrange for presenters to briefly inform the committee about the federal budgeting process who could speak to facts and options for consideration – without making recommendations.

Public Comment

Specific comments were requested on the following topics:

1. What policy solutions or approaches do you recommend to address the natural process issues (also referred to as landscape resiliency) discussed by the FFAC (e.g., mortality, fuels, wildfire, water quality, wildlife habitat impacts, timber investments, etc.) and why?
2. What are the potential opportunities and challenges presented by your proposed recommendations?

Wayne Giesy, Hull Oak Lumber Company, and Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Company, provided a copy of an article published in the *Journal of Forestry* in March 1971 by W. D. Hagenstein, entitled “Environmental Enigma”. Mr. Giesy suggested that the committee invite Mr. Hagenstein to make a presentation. Wade noted that he knew Mr. Hagenstein, who is now 93 years old, and was at the dedication of the nation’s first tree farm – Clemens Tree Farm – and would welcome his participation. Steve Hobbs noted that Mr. Hagenstein still attends Society of American Forester meetings.

Tom Partin, American Forest Resource Council, provided written comments and a hand-out entitled “U.S. Forest Service Discretionary Appropriations: FY 2006-2008”. He made three recommendations for policy solutions on the natural processes issue:

1. A change in federal budgeting allowing the use of hazardous fuels funds for sale preparation, lay-out, and administration. (These funds are currently only allowed for planning activities.) He suggested Chris Topic, staff for the House Interior Appropriations Committee, or Norm Dicks, staff for the Interior Appropriations Chairman, as possible speakers about the funding issue.
2. Of the projects in dry areas, few of them are HFRA projects, and almost all of them should be since these projects move quicker, with the chance to comment, resolve, and move forward.
3. ODF should have a position that is dedicated to federal lands coordination, as a myriad of staff address issues relating to federal forests and gubernatorial administrations change. ODF should have one person the federal agencies know to work with.

Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers, provided written comments and summarized several short-term and long-term suggestions. Short-term solutions include:

1. Rescind the eastside screens, which make many needed forest health improvements economically impossible and are a legal magnet for obstructive litigation.

2. The committee should provide written comment on the Westside BLM forest plan revision, which will open for comment at the end of July and be open through October, and the Blue Mountain Forest Plan.
3. Recommend that the U. S. Forest Service and the BLM create an imperative policy to expedite treatments to remediate forest damage by catastrophic events.

Long-term policy changes:

1. Create a county stakeholder group of business and government individuals to advise the federal agencies on the local economic situation of the federal forestlands surrounding their communities.
2. Improve line manager authority, allowing for greater professional responsibility at the local level.
3. Re-double investment in the workforce, as both the U. S. Forest Service and the BLM have disinvested through downsizing and other programs over the past 15 years.
4. Complete forest plan revisions by 2011. Oregon's national forests are currently operating without current forest plans for individual forests.
5. The agencies should identify and remedy the self-imposed restrictions and obstacles that prevent them from land management (indirect de-facto prohibitions).

Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild, provided the following suggestions:

1. He cautioned the committee not to leap to solutions and recommendations until all of the different issues have been heard because, as the committee discussed, many of the issues are inter-connected.
2. He emphasized a rational decision-making process when choosing recommendations, which he stated the committee had already begun.
3. He suggested also asking the speakers/presenters to identify existing policy initiatives for addressing the problem. Many of the issues already have different policy initiatives to solve the problem. We need to identify which is the most effective and can get us the furthest.
4. He suggested the committee include the same structure as the questions for the speakers in the final report – different policy options or consequences should be a part of that document.

Natural Processes (Landscape Resiliency) Discussion

Robert provided an overview of the process for developing the “Natural Process Issue Proposed Policy Recommendations Draft Starting Point for Discussions” (dated 7/2/07) and the previous iteration of the natural processes discussion draft. As an outcome of the presentations at the Bend meeting, the committee directed staff to generate a write-up of the issue, including proposed policy recommendations, the committee could use as a jumping-off point for discussion. When that document was provided to committee members the comments and discussion centered around the language in the written document – instead of a discussion about the proposed policy recommendations themselves. One committee member re-drafted the document and provided that draft to committee members. For this meeting, staff extracted the policy recommendations, along with a statement of the problem, to create a simpler, one-page document that hopefully will focus discussion on the policy approaches and generate policy recommendations.

Cathy MacDonald reviewed Russ' proposed revision, which was an attempt to provide an integrated approach recognizing the interrelationship among the issues.

Kevin discussed the draft policy recommendations and noted they were a "strawman" to generate comment and discussion.

Committee discussion of the proposed and additional ideas for consideration on the natural processes issue included:

- Crisis nature and urgency of this issue and the need to reflect that in the written work; perhaps with a timeline, or short-term, long-term recommendations
- Need to state the objectives the policy recommendations are intended to address
- Need for implementation recommendations
- Need for educational process about the forest health crisis in Oregon by governmental and elected officials, business persons, and everyone who is involved with Oregon's forests
- Capitalizing on projects that have been worked out in a collaborative process with comments and participation to be able to accomplish projects that are less controversial (example: eastside low-elevation, primarily ponderosa pine forests as opposed to the more-controversial projects in higher-elevation mixed conifer forests –again on the eastside)
- Guaranteed funding for projects over a longer period of time than just one budget cycle
- Guarantee on projects that project team members will not be reassigned during fire season
- Mobile teams of specialists to assist with projects to get accomplishments within quicker timeframes
- Reorganizing forest land management by eco-regions – not just boundary or ownership lands; restructure and create management teams on a scale small enough for involvement
- Put the funds where the lands need management, rather than "forests" competing against each other" for funds
- Recommendations should be organized to address economic, environmental, and social aspects of the issue
- Referring to #1 under the "New Initiatives" – caution about duplicating processes
- Referring to #2 under the "New Initiatives" – previous difficulties with programmatic EIS documents, particularly on a large scale (statewide) with litigation
- Referring to #3 under the "New Initiatives" – Community Wildfire Protection Plans, under the National Fire Plan, are prioritizing treatments already

Steve Hobbs stated that the committee discussion on this issue illustrated a need for an organized, systematic approach and process for the committee to use to work through the issues. He will work with Robert and the Planning Team to develop that for the next committee discussion in August. However, the information that has been generated and captured to date regarding the natural processes issue will be "parked" until the process is in place.

Other suggestions included discussing the solutions recommended by speakers at the time of those presentations, even if that information is held until later, or re-visited because of the inter-connectivity of the issues. Planning Team members, as liaisons of other agencies, were also requested to provide information on policies that were already in place to address the issues that the committee would be discussing.

Review Draft Meeting Summaries – April, May, June

May and June meeting summaries have not yet been distributed. There was a technical difficult with the May meeting in that the recording equipment failed and there was no back-up information available as the meeting was out-of-town and individuals who would have normally been note-taking were not in attendance. Consequently the May meeting summary may not be as comprehensive as previous summaries. The May and June meeting summaries will be provided to the committee prior to the August meeting. Robert asked for any comments, changes, or questions about the April meeting summary, which had previously been distributed prior to the May meeting. There were none, and the April meeting summary is considered final.

Summary and Next Steps

Steve Hobbs summarized the following resulting action items from the meeting:

- Speakers need to be scheduled for the August meeting on federal funding
- The Implementation Subcommittee needs to get up and running. He has approached a Board of Forestry member about participating and will follow up on that.
- Begin arranging speakers for Problems #2, #3, #5, #9, since they are all busy individuals who will be difficult to schedule
- He will work with Kevin and Robert to develop the organized approach to move through the problem discussions.

He then adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Attending:

Committee Members: Ralph Bloemers, Allyn Ford, Chuck Graham, Steve Grasty, Steve Hobbs, Bill Kluting, R. Wade Mosby, Ken Williamson.

Staff: Lisa Freedman, U. S. Forest Service; Mike Haske, Bureau of Land Management; Kevin Birch, Cathy Clem, Jeri Chase, ODF; Koto Kishida, DEQ; Rod Krahmer, ODFW; Dave Powers, EPA; Suzy Driver; Robert Fisher, FCS.

Public: Cathy MacDonald, The Nature Conservancy; Dick Posekany, Frank Lumber Company; Wayne Giesy, Hull-Oaks Lumber Company; Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers; Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild; Tom Partin, American Forest Resources Council.

Note: All written materials and presentations provided to the committee and referred to in this meeting summary are available on the committee's website at www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/FFAC.shtml.